



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/728,676

12/04/2003

Anil K. Kumar

1020P17115

9059

57035

7590

10/15/2008

KACVINSKY LLC
C/O INTELLEVATE
P.O. BOX 52050
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

SCIACCA, SCOTT M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2446

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/15/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/728,676	Applicant(s) KUMAR, ANIL K.	
	Examiner Scott M. Sciacca	Art Unit 2446	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 10, 17 and 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to communications filed on July 25, 2008. Claims 1, 10, 17 and 24 have been amended. Claims 1-30 are pending in the application.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 25, 2008 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1, 10, 17 and 24 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims recite the limitation "a media access control data service unit (MDSU) size." Examiner believes this limitation should be written as "a media access control service data unit (MSDU) size" in accordance with Applicant's specification (See p. 9, paragraph [0026]) and the cited prior art (See Cimini, Jr. et al. (US 7,301,965), Col. 1, lines 36-37). For the purpose of examination, the limitation will be treated as if it were written as "a media access control service data unit (MSDU) size."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wentink (US 7,136,392) in view of Cimini, Jr. et al. (US 7,301,965) and Hejza (US 6,577,628).

Regarding Claim 1, Wentink teaches a method comprising:

in response, at least in part, to a request for a service from a system, determining a quality of service to assign to an application to be executed by the system to provide the service, the quality of service based, at least in part, on one or more service characteristics of the application (*"For example, in a network that supports multimedia services like video-on-demand, video conferencing, online brokerage, and electronic commerce, a QoS mechanism can prioritize time-sensitive multimedia data streams so that their packets are transmitted--over a communication medium or channel shared by two or more terminals or stations--with less delay and/or at a higher rate than packets of data streams less affected or unaffected by delay"* – See Col. 1, lines 20-28; *"an internal queue in any one of the stations is configured to delay and/or release data messages of a given priority level according to a set of rules"* – See Col. 2, lines 16-19); and

Art Unit: 2446

allocating one or more resources to the application, the one or more resources being based, at least in part, on the quality of service (*"Quality of service (QoS) mechanisms allocate transmission resources to different types or classes of data traffic so that certain traffic classes can be preferentially served over other classes"* – See Col. 1, lines 16-20).

Wentink does not explicitly teach determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data associated with the service. Nor does Wentink explicitly teach allocating to the application, the one or more resources being based, at least in part, on a media access control service data unit (MSDU) size.

However, Cimini teaches determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data based on the quality of service (*"In step 144, the predictor 114 computes the desirable MSDU size according to Eq. (8) below"* – See Col. 8, lines 35-37; *"desirable MSDU size=desired throughput*(the average packet length/average throughput) Eq. (8)"* – See Col. 8, lines 39-40; Guaranteed throughput is considered to be a quality of service attribute. Thus, calculating an MSDU size as a function of desired throughput is the same as determining a size of packets based on the quality of service).

Cimini further teaches allocating resources to an application, the resources being based on a media access control service data unit (MSDU) size (*"the packet shaping mechanism sets a maximum MSDU size limit based on node data rate so that the maximum transmission time of all the nodes is the same"* – See Col. 1, lines 42-44; As shown above, Wentink mentions several multimedia applications which rely on networks

Art Unit: 2446

as a resource. Cimini allocates network resources (i.e., transmission time) by controlling the MSDU size).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method taught by Wentink of determining a quality of service to assign to an application to include the additional step of determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data. As shown by Wentink, multiple stations share a communication medium (*"Stations of a communication network have internal queues for accumulating and transmitting data messages over a shared communication channel"* – See Abstract). According to Cimini, it is possible for multiple stations sharing a communication medium to experience different data rates. Determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data provides the advantage of equally distributing transmission times of all nodes which results in improved network capacity (*"Because the packet shaping mechanism sets a maximum MSDU size limit based on node data rate so that the maximum transmission time of all the nodes is the same, network channel resources are equally distributed among all the nodes. By applying different limits in such a manner, it is possible to improve network capacity when there are mixed rate nodes in the network"* – See Col. 1, lines 42-49).

Wentink and Cimini do not explicitly teach mapping one or more service characteristics to a class of service database. However, Hejza does teach mapping one or more service characteristics to a class of service database (*"FIG. 8 illustrates an exemplary forwarding database 800 of a packet forwarding device according to one embodiment of the present invention"* – See Col. 11, lines 11-13; *"Exemplary entries*

Art Unit: 2446

810, 820, and 830 which contain certain wildcarded fields may correspond to the high priority class of service, the medium priority class of service, and the low priority class of service, respectively. Therefore, packets originated at clients assigned IP addresses in the range 199.71.10.0 through 199.71.10.255 will be forwarded by the packet forwarding device according to the forwarding rules associated with the high priority class of service” – See Col. 11, lines 18-26; Thus, Wentink shows a database where forwarding rules (service characteristics) are mapped to a class of service).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify Wentink with Cimini to map the service characteristics to a class of service database. Motivation for doing so would be to allow a particular forwarding behavior to be applied to one or more types of traffic (See Hejza, Col. 5, line 67 & Col. 6, lines 1-2).

Regarding Claim 2, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the method of Claim 1. Wentink further teaches the system comprising a modified intelligent media center (MIMC) (See Fig. 2 which shows a media station), and said determining a quality of service to assign to an application to be executed by the system to provide the service comprising determining a quality of service to assign to a multimedia application to be executed by the MIMC to provide the service (*“For example, in a network that supports multimedia services like video-on-demand, video conferencing, online brokerage, and electronic commerce, a QoS mechanism can prioritize time-sensitive multimedia data streams so that their packets are transmitted--over a communication*

Art Unit: 2446

medium or channel shared by two or more terminals or stations--with less delay and/or at a higher rate than packets of data streams less affected or unaffected by delay” –

See Col. 1, lines 20-28).

Regarding Claim 3, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the method of Claim 2. Wentink further teaches said determining the quality of service to assign to the multimedia application comprising assigning one or more QoS (quality of service) parameters to the application (*“However, in accordance with an illustrative embodiment of the present invention, the release, for transmission, of data messages having the same level of priority is governed by a set of parameters that is common for all stations of the network” – See Col. 2, lines 12-16*), the QoS parameters being based on a class of service associated with the one or more service characteristics of the multimedia application (*“That is, an internal queue in any one of the stations is configured to delay and/or release data messages of a given priority level according to a set of rules that applies identically to the internal queue of any other station that handles data messages of that same priority level” – See Col. 2, lines 16-21*).

Regarding Claim 4, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the method of Claim 3. Wentink further teaches the multimedia application being a wireless application (*“Initially, it should be noted that it may be desirable to increase the probability of successful transfer of (MSDUs) across a shared channel such, for example, as the wireless medium employed by the illustrative embodiment of the*

Art Unit: 2446

present invention” – See Col. 3, lines 51-55), and the one or more QoS parameters comprising at least one of:

AIFS (arbitration inter-frame space) (*“the highest priority traffic class is directed to a queue that waits for a minimum interframe space interval $QIFS_0$ ”* – See Col. 7, lines 19-21);

CW_{min} (minimum contention window) (*“The scheduling function of the illustrative embodiment further specifies a contention window CW_{min} from which a random back off is computed for each queue”* – See Col. 6, lines 56-59);

CW_{max} (maximum contention window) (*“It should be noted that although a single value of CW_{max} common to all stations is suggested in FIG. 5, it is also possible to provide differentiated $CW_{max}[i]$ values for the respective queues”* – See Col. 8, lines 10-13); and

PF (persistence factor) (*“the persistence factor, PF , is computed using the following procedure”* – See Col. 9, lines 6-7).

Regarding Claim 5, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the method of Claim 3. Wentink does not explicitly teach said determining the quality of service to assign to the multimedia application additionally comprising determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data associated with the multimedia application from the system to a client. However, Cimini does teach determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data (*“In step 144, the predictor 114 computes the desirable MSDU size according to Eq. (8) below”* – See Col. 8, lines 35-37; “desirable MSDU

Art Unit: 2446

size=desired throughput(the average packet length/average throughput) Eq. (8)*” – See Col. 8, lines 39-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine a size of packets to be used for transmitting data for the same reasons as those given with respect to Claim 1.

Regarding Claim 6, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the method of Claim 5. Cimini further teaches said determining the size of packets comprising determining a size of an MSDU (MAC – media access layer – service data unit) based, at least in part, on at least one of the one or more service characteristics (*“In step 144, the predictor 114 computes the desirable MSDU size according to Eq. (8) below”* – See Col. 8, lines 35-37; *“desirable MSDU size=desired throughput*(the average packet length/average throughput) Eq. (8)”* – See Col. 8, lines 39-40; Note that one of the values used to calculate the size of an MSDU is the average throughput).

Regarding Claim 7, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the method of Claim 6. As shown above with respect to Claim 1, Wentink in view of Cimini teaches determining the size of data packets used for transmitting data based on a service characteristic (i.e., data rate). Wentink further teaches that service characteristics may include a priority associated with a class of service (*“Each internal queue of a station individually accumulates and releases, for transmission during an appropriate transmission opportunity, data messages that have a specific traffic classification and, hence, a different level of priority than those accumulated and released by other internal*

Art Unit: 2446

queues of that station” – See Col. 2, lines 2-7). Cimini generally teaches “packet shaping” (i.e., modifying the size of packets being used to transit data) being useful for improving capacity in a network (See Col. 1, lines 42-49), except that the packet shaping is based on data rates experienced by different nodes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine the size of an MSDU based on a priority associated with the class of service disclosed by Wentink. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide the desired throughput levels for services with a particular priority level (*“Transmission opportunities are thus fairly allocated between all queues containing data messages of the same priority level”* – See Wentink’s Abstract).

Regarding Claim 8, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the method of Claim 1. Wentink further teaches said allocating the one or more resources to the application based, at least in part, on the quality of service comprising assigning at least one of:

a processing throughput (*“Each wireless station further includes a general-purpose processing unit (CPU) 20a-20e”* – See Col. 4, lines 49-51; *“Application programs stored within the memory at each wireless station are executed by its CPU”* – See Col. 4, lines 51-53);

a queue length (*“Transmission opportunities are thus fairly allocated between all queues containing data messages of the same priority level”* – See Abstract); and

Art Unit: 2446

memory buffer size (*“Using the information received via VxD 26c, data message units from a given session are mapped to one of these n traffic classifications and placed in a corresponding one of queues 50_0 through 50_n within data buffers 34”* – See Col. 6, lines 11-14).

Regarding Claim 9, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the method of Claim 1. Wentink further teaches the method additionally comprising:

queuing the application for servicing (*“A method according to an illustrative embodiment of the invention comprises directing, to a first output queue at a first station of a communication network, data message units that are to be transmitted over a communication medium and that have a first traffic classification”* – See Col. 2, lines 24-28); and

scheduling the application for servicing (*“Once placed within one of the queues, the data message units are released in accordance with a coordination function (CF) implemented in a scheduler 52 which prioritizes the transmission of data message units from each queue in accordance with a defined access control algorithm”* – See Col. 6, lines 14-19).

Regarding Claim 10, Wentink teaches an apparatus comprising:

circuitry capable of:

in response, at least in part, to a request for a service from a system, determining a quality of service to assign to an application to be executed by the system to provide

Art Unit: 2446

the service, the quality of service based, at least in part, on one or more service characteristics of the application (*"For example, in a network that supports multimedia services like video-on-demand, video conferencing, online brokerage, and electronic commerce, a QoS mechanism can prioritize time-sensitive multimedia data streams so that their packets are transmitted--over a communication medium or channel shared by two or more terminals or stations--with less delay and/or at a higher rate than packets of data streams less affected or unaffected by delay"* – See Col. 1, lines 20-28; *"an internal queue in any one of the stations is configured to delay and/or release data messages of a given priority level according to a set of rules"* – See Col. 2, lines 16-19); and

allocating one or more resources to the application, the one or more resources based, at least in part, on the quality of service (*"Quality of service (QoS) mechanisms allocate transmission resources to different types or classes of data traffic so that certain traffic classes can be preferentially served over other classes"* – See Col. 1, lines 16-20).

Wentink does not explicitly teach determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data associated with the service. Nor does Wentink explicitly teach allocating to the application, the one or more resources being based, at least in part, on a media access control service data unit (MSDU) size.

However, Cimini teaches determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data based on the quality of service (*"In step 144, the predictor 114 computes the desirable MSDU size according to Eq. (8) below"* – See Col. 8, lines 35-37; *"desirable MSDU size=desired throughput*(the average packet length/average*

Art Unit: 2446

throughput) Eq. (8)” – See Col. 8, lines 39-40; Guaranteed throughput is considered to be a quality of service attribute. Thus, calculating an MSDU size as a function of desired throughput is the same as determining a size of packets based on the quality of service).

Cimini further teaches allocating resources to an application, the resources being based on a media access control service data unit (MSDU) size (*“the packet shaping mechanism sets a maximum MSDU size limit based on node data rate so that the maximum transmission time of all the nodes is the same”* – See Col. 1, lines 42-44; As shown above, Wentink mentions several multimedia applications which rely on networks as a resource. Cimini allocates network resources (i.e., transmission time) by controlling the MSDU size).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method taught by Wentink of determining a quality of service to assign to an application to include the additional step of determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data for the same reasons as those given with respect to Claim 1.

Wentink and Cimini do not explicitly teach mapping one or more service characteristics to a class of service database. However, Hejza does teach mapping one or more service characteristics to a class of service database (*“FIG. 8 illustrates an exemplary forwarding database 800 of a packet forwarding device according to one embodiment of the present invention”* – See Col. 11, lines 11-13; *“Exemplary entries 810, 820, and 830 which contain certain wildcarded fields may correspond to the high*

Art Unit: 2446

priority class of service, the medium priority class of service, and the low priority class of service, respectively. Therefore, packets originated at clients assigned IP addresses in the range 199.71.10.0 through 199.71.10.255 will be forwarded by the packet forwarding device according to the forwarding rules associated with the high priority class of service” – See Col. 11, lines 18-26; Thus, Wentink shows a database where forwarding rules (service characteristics) are mapped to a class of service).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify Wentink with Cimini to map the service characteristics to a class of service database for the same reasons as those given with respect to Claim 1.

Regarding Claim 11, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the apparatus of Claim 10. Wentink further teaches the system comprising a modified intelligent media center (MIMC) (See Fig. 2 which shows a media station), and the circuitry that is capable of determining a quality of service to assign to an application to be executed by the system to provide the service is capable of determining a quality of service to assign to a multimedia application to be executed by the MIMC to provide the service (*“For example, in a network that supports multimedia services like video-on-demand, video conferencing, online brokerage, and electronic commerce, a QoS mechanism can prioritize time-sensitive multimedia data streams so that their packets are transmitted-- over a communication medium or channel shared by two or more terminals or stations-- with less delay and/or at a higher rate than packets of data streams less affected or unaffected by delay” – See Col. 1, lines 20-28).*

Regarding Claim 12, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the apparatus of Claim 11. Wentink further teaches said circuitry capable of determining the quality of service to assign to the multimedia application also being capable of assigning one or more QoS (quality of service) parameters to the multimedia application (*“However, in accordance with an illustrative embodiment of the present invention, the release, for transmission, of data messages having the same level of priority is governed by a set of parameters that is common for all stations of the network”* – See Col. 2, lines 12-16).

Regarding Claim 13, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the apparatus of Claim 12. Wentink further teaches the multimedia application being a wireless application (*“Initially, it should be noted that it may be desirable to increase the probability of successful transfer of (MSDUs) across a shared channel such, for example, as the wireless medium employed by the illustrative embodiment of the present invention”* – See Col. 3, lines 51-55), and the one or more QoS parameters comprising at least one of:

AIFS (arbitration inter-frame space) (*“the highest priority traffic class is directed to a queue that waits for a minimum interframe space interval $QIFS_0$ ”* – See Col. 7, lines 19-21);

CW_{min} (minimum contention window) (*“The scheduling function of the illustrative embodiment further specifies a contention window CW_{min} from which a random back off is computed for each queue”* – See Col. 6, lines 56-59);

CW_{\max} (maximum contention window) (*“It should be noted that although a single value of CW_{\max} common to all stations is suggested in FIG. 5, it is also possible to provide differentiated $CW_{\max}[i]$ values for the respective queues”* – See Col. 8, lines 10-13); and

PF (persistence factor) (*“the persistence factor, PF, is computed using the following procedure”* – See Col. 9, lines 6-7).

Regarding Claim 14, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the apparatus of Claim 12. Wentink further teaches said circuitry capable of determining the quality of service to assign to the multimedia application also being capable of determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data associated with the multimedia application from the system to a client (*“Each contention window value is 1 octet in length and contains an unsigned integer”* – See Col. 8, lines 47-48).

Regarding Claim 15, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the apparatus of Claim 10. Wentink further teaches said circuitry capable of allocating the one or more resources to the application based, at least in part, on the quality of service also being capable of assigning at least one of:

a processing throughput (*“Each wireless station further includes a general-purpose processing unit (CPU) 20a-20e”* – See Col. 4, lines 49-51; *“Application programs stored within the memory at each wireless station are executed by its CPU”* – See Col. 4, lines 51-53);

Art Unit: 2446

a queue length (*“Transmission opportunities are thus fairly allocated between all queues containing data messages of the same priority level”* – See Abstract); and

memory buffer size (*“Using the information received via VxD 26c, data message units from a given session are mapped to one of these n traffic classifications and placed in a corresponding one of queues 50_0 through 50_n within data buffers 34”* – See Col. 6, lines 11-14).

Regarding Claim 16, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the apparatus of Claim 10. Wentink further teaches that said circuitry is additionally capable of:

queuing the application for servicing (*“A method according to an illustrative embodiment of the invention comprises directing, to a first output queue at a first station of a communication network, data message units that are to be transmitted over a communication medium and that have a first traffic classification”* – See Col. 2, lines 24-28); and

scheduling the application for servicing (*“Once placed within one of the queues, the data message units are released in accordance with a coordination function (CF) implemented in a scheduler 52 which prioritizes the transmission of data message units from each queue in accordance with a defined access control algorithm”* – See Col. 6, lines 14-19).

Regarding Claim 17, Wentink teaches a system comprising:

Art Unit: 2446

one or more applications to be executed to provide one or more services to one or more clients (*“Application programs stored within the memory at each wireless station are executed by its CPU and communicate over the WLAN through its NIC”* – See Col. 4, lines 51-54);

one or more resources to support the execution of the one or more applications (*“Each wireless station further includes a general-purpose processing unit (CPU) 20a-20e and a memory 22a-22e”* – See Col. 4, lines 49-51);

a wireless network interface card to receive from the one or more clients, one or more requests for a service (*“In any event, and with continued reference to the illustrative communication network of FIG. 1, it will be seen that each of wireless stations 12a 12e includes a respective network interface controller (NIC) 16a 16e that is coupled to a corresponding antenna 18a 18e”* – See Col. 4, lines 45-49); and

circuitry communicatively coupled to the wireless network interface card, and capable of:

in response, at least in part, to a request for a service, determining a quality of service to assign to one of the applications to provide one of the one or more services, the quality of service based, at least in part, on one or more service characteristics of the application (*“For example, in a network that supports multimedia services like video-on-demand, video conferencing, online brokerage, and electronic commerce, a QoS mechanism can prioritize time-sensitive multimedia data streams so that their packets are transmitted--over a communication medium or channel shared by two or more terminals or stations--with less delay and/or at a higher rate than packets of data*

Art Unit: 2446

streams less affected or unaffected by delay” – See Col. 1, lines 20-28; *“an internal queue in any one of the stations is configured to delay and/or release data messages of a given priority level according to a set of rules”* – See Col. 2, lines 16-19); and

allocating at least one of the one or more resources to the application, the at least one of the one or more resources based, at least in part, on the quality of service (*“Quality of service (QoS) mechanisms allocate transmission resources to different types or classes of data traffic so that certain traffic classes can be preferentially served over other classes”* – See Col. 1, lines 16-20).

Wentink does not explicitly teach determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data associated with the service. Nor does Wentink explicitly teach allocating to the application, the one or more resources being based, at least in part, on a media access control service data unit (MSDU) size.

However, Cimini teaches determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data (*“In step 144, the predictor 114 computes the desirable MSDU size according to Eq. (8) below”* – See Col. 8, lines 35-37; *“desirable MSDU size=desired throughput*(the average packet length/average throughput) Eq. (8)”* – See Col. 8, lines 39-40; Guaranteed throughput is considered to be a quality of service attribute. Thus, calculating an MSDU size as a function of desired throughput is the same as determining a size of packets based on the quality of service).

Cimini further teaches allocating resources to an application, the resources being based on a media access control service data unit (MSDU) size (*“the packet shaping mechanism sets a maximum MSDU size limit based on node data rate so that the*

Art Unit: 2446

maximum transmission time of all the nodes is the same” – See Col. 1, lines 42-44; As shown above, Wentink mentions several multimedia applications which rely on networks as a resource. Cimini allocates network resources (i.e., transmission time) by controlling the MSDU size).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method taught by Wentink of determining a quality of service to assign to an application to include the additional step of determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data for the same reasons as those given with respect to Claim 1.

Wentink and Cimini do not explicitly teach mapping one or more service characteristics to a class of service database. However, Hejza does teach mapping one or more service characteristics to a class of service database (*“FIG. 8 illustrates an exemplary forwarding database 800 of a packet forwarding device according to one embodiment of the present invention”* – See Col. 11, lines 11-13; *“Exemplary entries 810, 820, and 830 which contain certain wildcarded fields may correspond to the high priority class of service, the medium priority class of service, and the low priority class of service, respectively. Therefore, packets originated at clients assigned IP addresses in the range 199.71.10.0 through 199.71.10.255 will be forwarded by the packet forwarding device according to the forwarding rules associated with the high priority class of service”* – See Col. 11, lines 18-26; Thus, Wentink shows a database where forwarding rules (service characteristics) are mapped to a class of service).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify Wentink with Cimini to map the service characteristics to a class of service database for the same reasons as those given with respect to Claim 1.

Regarding Claim 18, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the system of Claim 17. Wentink further teaches the system comprising a modified intelligent media center (MIMC) (See Fig. 2 which shows a media station), and the circuitry that is capable of determining a quality of service to assign to an application to be executed by the system to provide the service being capable of determining a quality of service to assign to a multimedia application to be executed by the MIMC to provide the service (*"For example, in a network that supports multimedia services like video-on-demand, video conferencing, online brokerage, and electronic commerce, a QoS mechanism can prioritize time-sensitive multimedia data streams so that their packets are transmitted--over a communication medium or channel shared by two or more terminals or stations--with less delay and/or at a higher rate than packets of data streams less affected or unaffected by delay"* – See Col. 1, lines 20-28).

Regarding Claim 19, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the system of Claim 18. Wentink further teaches said circuitry capable of determining the quality of service to assign to the multimedia application also being capable of assigning one or more QoS (quality of service) parameters to the multimedia application (*"However, in accordance with an illustrative embodiment of the present invention, the release, for*

Art Unit: 2446

transmission, of data messages having the same level of priority is governed by a set of parameters that is common for all stations of the network” – See Col. 2, lines 12-16).

Regarding Claim 20, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the system of Claim 19. Wentink further teaches said circuitry capable of determining the quality of service to assign to the multimedia application also being capable of determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data associated with the multimedia application from the system to the client (*“Each contention window value is 1 octet in length and contains an unsigned integer” – See Col. 8, lines 47-48).*

Regarding Claim 21, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the system of Claim 17. Wentink further teaches said circuitry capable of allocating the one or more resources to the multimedia application based, at least in part, on the quality of service also being capable of assigning at least one of:

a processing throughput (*“Each wireless station further includes a general-purpose processing unit (CPU) 20a-20e” – See Col. 4, lines 49-51; “Application programs stored within the memory at each wireless station are executed by its CPU” – See Col. 4, lines 51-53);*

a queue length (*“Transmission opportunities are thus fairly allocated between all queues containing data messages of the same priority level” – See Abstract); and*

memory buffer size (*“Using the information received via VxD 26c, data message units from a given session are mapped to one of these n traffic classifications and*

Art Unit: 2446

placed in a corresponding one of queues 50₀ through 50_n within data buffers 34” – See Col. 6, lines 11-14).

Regarding Claim 22, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the system of Claim 17. Wentink further teaches that said circuitry is additionally capable of:

queuing the application for servicing (“A method according to an illustrative embodiment of the invention comprises directing, to a first output queue at a first station of a communication network, data message units that are to be transmitted over a communication medium and that have a first traffic classification” – See Col. 2, lines 24-28);

and scheduling the application for servicing (“Once placed within one of the queues, the data message units are released in accordance with a coordination function (CF) implemented in a scheduler 52 which prioritizes the transmission of data message units from each queue in accordance with a defined access control algorithm” – See Col. 6, lines 14-19).

Regarding Claim 23, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the system of Claim 17. Wentink further teaches said circuitry being capable of operating in a bearer plane of a communications environment (*“a QoS scheme in which each of two time-sensitive streams of multimedia traffic--with each originating at a different station on the LAN--is assigned an identical level of transmission priority” – See Col. 1, lines 40-43).*

Art Unit: 2446

Regarding Claim 24, Wentink teaches a machine-readable medium having stored thereon instructions, the instructions when executed by a machine, result in the following:

in response, at least in part, to a request for a service from a system, determining a quality of service to assign to an application to be executed by the system to provide the service, the quality of service based, at least in part, on one or more service characteristics of the application (*“For example, in a network that supports multimedia services like video-on-demand, video conferencing, online brokerage, and electronic commerce, a QoS mechanism can prioritize time-sensitive multimedia data streams so that their packets are transmitted--over a communication medium or channel shared by two or more terminals or stations--with less delay and/or at a higher rate than packets of data streams less affected or unaffected by delay”* – See Col. 1, lines 20-28; *“an internal queue in any one of the stations is configured to delay and/or release data messages of a given priority level according to a set of rules”* – See Col. 2, lines 16-19); and

allocating one or more resources to the application, the one or more resources based, at least in part, on the quality of service (*“Quality of service (QoS) mechanisms allocate transmission resources to different types or classes of data traffic so that certain traffic classes can be preferentially served over other classes”* – See Col. 1, lines 16-20).

Wentink does not explicitly teach determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data associated with the service. Nor does Wentink explicitly teach

Art Unit: 2446

allocating to the application, the one or more resources being based, at least in part, on a media access control service data unit (MSDU) size.

However, Cimini teaches determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data (*"In step 144, the predictor 114 computes the desirable MSDU size according to Eq. (8) below"* – See Col. 8, lines 35-37; *"desirable MSDU size=desired throughput*(the average packet length/average throughput) Eq. (8)"* – See Col. 8, lines 39-40; Guaranteed throughput is considered to be a quality of service attribute. Thus, calculating an MSDU size as a function of desired throughput is the same as determining a size of packets based on the quality of service).

Cimini further teaches allocating resources to an application, the resources being based on a media access control service data unit (MSDU) size (*"the packet shaping mechanism sets a maximum MSDU size limit based on node data rate so that the maximum transmission time of all the nodes is the same"* – See Col. 1, lines 42-44; As shown above, Wentink mentions several multimedia applications which rely on networks as a resource. Cimini allocates network resources (i.e., transmission time) by controlling the MSDU size).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method taught by Wentink of determining a quality of service to assign to an application to include the additional step of determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data for the same reasons as those given with respect to Claim 1.

Wentink and Cimini do not explicitly teach mapping one or more service characteristics to a class of service database. However, Hejza does teach mapping one or more service characteristics to a class of service database (*“FIG. 8 illustrates an exemplary forwarding database 800 of a packet forwarding device according to one embodiment of the present invention”* – See Col. 11, lines 11-13; *“Exemplary entries 810, 820, and 830 which contain certain wildcarded fields may correspond to the high priority class of service, the medium priority class of service, and the low priority class of service, respectively. Therefore, packets originated at clients assigned IP addresses in the range 199.71.10.0 through 199.71.10.255 will be forwarded by the packet forwarding device according to the forwarding rules associated with the high priority class of service”* – See Col. 11, lines 18-26; Thus, Wentink shows a database where forwarding rules (service characteristics) are mapped to a class of service).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify Wentink with Cimini to map the service characteristics to a class of service database for the same reasons as those given with respect to Claim 1.

Regarding Claim 25, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the machine-readable medium of Claim 24, wherein the system comprises a modified intelligent media center (MIMC) (See Fig. 2 which shows a media station), and said instructions that result in determining a quality of service to assign to the application result in determining a quality of service to assign to a multimedia application to be executed by the MIMC to provide the service (*“For example, in a network that supports multimedia*

Art Unit: 2446

services like video-on-demand, video conferencing, online brokerage, and electronic commerce, a QoS mechanism can prioritize time-sensitive multimedia data streams so that their packets are transmitted--over a communication medium or channel shared by two or more terminals or stations--with less delay and/or at a higher rate than packets of data streams less affected or unaffected by delay” – See Col. 1, lines 20-28).

Regarding Claim 26, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the machine-readable medium of Claim 25. Wentink further teaches that said instructions that result in determining the quality of service to assign to the multimedia application result in assigning one or more QoS (quality of service) parameters to the multimedia application (*“However, in accordance with an illustrative embodiment of the present invention, the release, for transmission, of data messages having the same level of priority is governed by a set of parameters that is common for all stations of the network” – See Col. 2, lines 12-16).*

Regarding Claim 27, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the machine-readable medium of Claim 26. Wentink further teaches the multimedia application being a wireless application (*“Initially, it should be noted that it may be desirable to increase the probability of successful transfer of (MSDUs) across a shared channel such, for example, as the wireless medium employed by the illustrative embodiment of the present invention” – See Col. 3, lines 51-55), and the one or more QoS parameters comprising at least one of:*

AIFS (arbitration inter-frame space) (arbitration inter-frame space) (*“the highest priority traffic class is directed to a queue that waits for a minimum interframe space interval $QIFS_0$ ”* – See Col. 7, lines 19-21);

CWmin (minimum contention window) (*“The scheduling function of the illustrative embodiment further specifies a contention window CWmin from which a random back off is computed for each queue”* – See Col. 6, lines 56-59);

CWmax (maximum contention window) (*“It should be noted that although a single value of CWmax common to all stations is suggested in FIG. 5, it is also possible to provide differentiated CWmax[i] values for the respective queues”* – See Col. 8, lines 10-13);

and PF (persistence factor) (*“the persistence factor, PF, is computed using the following procedure”* – See Col. 9, lines 6-7).

Regarding Claim 28, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the machine-readable medium of Claim 26. Wentink further teaches that said instructions, when executed by a machine, that result in determining the quality of service to assign to the multimedia application additionally result in determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data associated with the multimedia application from the system to a client (*“Each contention window value is 1 octet in length and contains an unsigned integer”* – See Col. 8, lines 47-48).

Art Unit: 2446

Regarding Claim 29, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the machine-readable medium of Claim 24. Wentink further teaches that said instructions, when executed by a machine, result in allocating the one or more resources to the application based, at least in part, on the quality of service additionally result in assigning at least one of:

a processing throughput (*“Each wireless station further includes a general-purpose processing unit (CPU) 20a-20e” – See Col. 4, lines 49-51; “Application programs stored within the memory at each wireless station are executed by its CPU” – See Col. 4, lines 51-53*);

a queue length (*“Transmission opportunities are thus fairly allocated between all queues containing data messages of the same priority level” – See Abstract*); and

memory buffer size (*“Using the information received via VxD 26c, data message units from a given session are mapped to one of these n traffic classifications and placed in a corresponding one of queues 50₀ through 50_n within data buffers 34” – See Col. 6, lines 11-14*).

Regarding Claim 30, Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza teaches the machine-readable medium of Claim 24. Wentink further teaches that said instructions, when executed by a machine, additionally result in:

queuing the application for servicing (*“A method according to an illustrative embodiment of the invention comprises directing, to a first output queue at a first station of a communication network, data message units that are to be transmitted over a*

Art Unit: 2446

communication medium and that have a first traffic classification” – See Col. 2, lines 24-28); and

scheduling the application for servicing (“Once placed within one of the queues, the data message units are released in accordance with a coordination function (CF) implemented in a scheduler 52 which prioritizes the transmission of data message units from each queue in accordance with a defined access control algorithm” – See Col. 6, lines 14-19).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1, 10, 17 and 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. Specifically, Applicant argues that Wentink (US 7,136,392) and Cimini, Jr. et al. (US 7,301,965) do not teach “mapping said one or more service characteristics to a class of service database,” as Claims 1, 10, 17 and 24 are currently amended to recite. This argument is moot since a new rejection has been made based on Wentink in view of Cimini and Hejza (US 6,577,628).

6. Applicant's arguments filed on July 25, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 12 of the remarks filed on July 25, 2008, Applicant states that “Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite ‘mapping said one or more service

Art Unit: 2446

characteristics to a class of service database; allocating one or more resources to the application, the one or more resources being based, at least in part, on the quality of service and a media access control data service unit (MDSU) size; and determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data associated with the service based on said quality of service.”

On page 13 of the remarks filed on July 25, 2008, Applicant argues that “Applicant submits that Wentink fails to teach or suggest the above-identified language of independent claims 1, 10, 17, and 24.”

On page 13 of the remarks filed on July 25, 2008, Applicant argues that “Furthermore, Applicant submits that the teachings of Cimini do not remedy the deficiencies of Wentink with respect to amended independent claims 1, 10, 17, and 24.”

The newly amended subject matter in Claim 1 which recites “allocating one or more resources to the application, the one or more resources being based, at least in part, on the quality of service and a media access control data service unit (MDSU) size” is shown to be taught by Cimini (*“the packet shaping mechanism sets a maximum MSDU size limit based on node data rate so that the maximum transmission time of all the nodes is the same”* – See Col. 1, lines 42-44).

As shown above with respect to Claim 1, Wentink mentions several multimedia applications which rely on networks as a resource (*“For example, in a network that supports multimedia services like video-on-demand, video conferencing, online brokerage, and electronic commerce, a QoS mechanism can prioritize time-sensitive*

Art Unit: 2446

multimedia data streams so that their packets are transmitted--over a communication medium or channel shared by two or more terminals or stations--with less delay and/or at a higher rate than packets of data streams less affected or unaffected by delay” –

See Col. 1, lines 20-28). Cimini allocates network resources (i.e., transmission time) by controlling the MSDU size.

The newly amended subject matter in Claim 1 which recites “determining a size of packets to be used for transmitting data associated with the service based on said quality of service” is shown to be taught by Cimini (“*In step 144, the predictor 114 computes the desirable MSDU size according to Eq. (8) below*” – See Col. 8, lines 35-37; “*desirable MSDU size=desired throughput*(the average packet length/average throughput) Eq. (8)*” – See Col. 8, lines 39-40).

Guaranteed throughput is considered to be a quality of service attribute. Thus, calculating an MSDU size as a function of desired throughput is the same as determining a size of packets based on the quality of service.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott M. Sciacca whose telephone number is (571) 270-1919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 7:30 A.M. - 5:00 P.M. EST.

Art Unit: 2446

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Pwu can be reached on (571) 272-6798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Scott M. Sciacca/
Examiner, Art Unit 2446

/Jeffrey Pwu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2446